

**SUB-COMMITTEE C
FISCAL, ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

**Larry Beerman, Chairman
John Herbert
Helena Syska
Staff Support: Melanie Wellman**

SUMMARY OF JUNE 12, 2006 MEETING

INTRODUCTION

The Sub-Committee reviewed options in Issue Paper 4, prepared July 25, 2005 to begin discussion.

DISCUSSION: FISCAL/ ECONOMIC IMPACT

The Sub-Committee discussed to what level of public facilities and services should be provided in the Upper Foley and Upper Broad Run Transition Subareas?

Staff provided three options, with the recommendation of Option C; to modify the Capital Facility Standards (CFS) for the Transition area to reflect the existing lack of facilities in the area. The Sub-Committee noted that Option B – reduce the cost of capital facilities either through a reduction in the level of services or through innovative design, financing and other means – is also important and should be incorporated into Option C. The Sub-Committee suggested a modified Option C, and developed the following wording – Change Capital Facilities Standards (CFS) to reflect the need based on existing conditions through innovative design, financing, and other means.

The Sub-Committee discussed to what extend should new development be contingent on availability of public facilities and services?

Staff provided two options, with the recommendation of Option A – Continue current policy and allow each to mitigate their share of impacts through incremental proffers and use the availability of services to evaluate rezonings. The Sub-Committee noted that fiscal impacts include operating costs and off-site costs, including environmental impacts such as runoff on adjacent properties, and clear-cutting of trees. The Commission agreed with the recommendation of Option A, but wants to expand the option to encompass other impacts, such as environmental impacts. Staff noted that there are policies in the Revised General Plan that address environmental impacts, and staff was asked to share these policies with the Sub-Committee at the subsequent meeting on June 22.

The Sub-Committee suggested that a related issue that should be discussed at the next subcommittee meeting is whether the proposed capital facilities policies should be applied Countywide or to the Upper Broad Run and Upper Foley Subareas only.

DISCUSSION: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

William Marsh, Department of Building and Development, was present to discuss staff's recommendations for policies related to environmental impact.

Regarding forest resources:

Staff recommended a minimum 50-foot riparian buffer be preserved between developed areas and adjacent streams and wetlands. Staff also addressed the benefit of applying a 100-foot buffer. The Commission asked if a 50-foot buffer is adequate. Staff replied that while a wider buffer would probably be better, a 50-foot buffer would be sufficient.

Regarding green infrastructure and open space:

Staff addressed the policies regarding open space ratios, and expressed concern that the goal of providing useable open space could conflict with the goal of preserving natural open space on site. Staff recommended that the open space ratios be increased. In addition, staff noted that natural features could be incorporated into park space or other interior space. To that end, staff stated that BMPs, such as rain gardens, could be incorporated into "leftover" areas, and should be considered a part of the open space on site. The Sub-Committee expressed agreement with these recommendations, but noted that leftover spaces should not be encouraged on-site. The Committee further noted that the policies should be worded in such a way as to not encourage providing only leftover spaces on-site.

Regarding Wetlands:

Staff recommended that Section A of the Green Infrastructure section of Chapter 8 be amended to emphasize wetland mitigation within the Upper Broad Run watershed. The Committee agreed that there needs to be a much clearer policy that requires mitigation on-site where appropriate, and asked staff to come up with the strongest possible wording.

Regarding water quality and stormwater management:

Staff expressed the need for aggressive BMPs for both subareas. Staff offers three policy recommendations: 1) less than 10% impervious cover on site; 2) a pesticide and fertilizer plan for residential and commercial subdivisions and; 3) commitment to implement low impact development (LID). The Commission stated that the first and third statements should be very clear requirements. However, they also noted that the second statement could be a challenging policy to implement.

NEXT STEPS

Staff will compile policies from the Revised General Plan that address environmental elements and bring to the June 22nd meeting. Staff will also review the draft policies to suggest wording that strengthens the policies per the Sub-Committees suggestions.